

**From:** Beth Ericksen  
**To:** mdalley@stakerparson.com  
**Date:** 11/30/2007 2:04 PM  
**Subject:** Comments on Map Drafts for Kiegley Quarry

PIC

m/049/0001

**\*\* For Your Eyes Only \*\***

**CC:** Kunzler, Lynn; White, Susan  
 Mike,

I have reviewed the 'draft' maps that were brought into the Division recently, and have the following comments:

I have referenced specific comments within the context of each map. the maps are referenced by number and not title.

#### Map 1

Remove title referring to Five-Year Review of Reclamation Surety Estimate

Explain in the legend what the property boundary defines. (There are many magenta lines within the interior of the outer magenta lines which isn't explained) OR just show the outer boundary

Show and label route of access to the site from the nearest public highway

Include the state issued permit number on every map

#### Map 2

Areas of pre-disturbance is shown within the bonded area. Therefore, define what is meant by pre-disturbance. Does that pre-disturbed and reclaimed? If so, it should be labeled as 'reclaimed'. The map 5 shows this area being disturbed by the reclamation plan

The pre disturbance shown outside of the bonded area is part of another permit, if so, ID the permit number. If not part of another permit, then why isn't it bonded?

See above bullet, to help clarify state the year of last disturbance.

Furthermore, the pre-disturbed area along the east property boundary north of the current mining disturbance is labeled 'gravel pit', so as per bullet 2 and 3 more detail is needed for clarification.

The current mining disturbed area on the southeast portion of the bonded area, has what appears to be a road outside of the bonded area. Is that a public road? If so, a portion is within the bonded area? Why? if it is a haul road or company private road, then why is a portion of it outside of the bonded area?

Identify the acreage separately of the pre-disturbed area to the north east of the current mining area  
 provide the date the area was flown (for all maps)

The 800 North Sprinkler group property appears to have mining disturbance. If it is mining disturbance, why isn't it within the bonded area?

#### Map 3

As a note, the facilities map is a very important map. The submitted draft lacks a significant amount of detail and several improvements are required but may not be limited to:

Change layer and color of labels and arrows near the southwest corner of the property shown in this map and subsequent maps

The facilities map is lacking details. Need to identify each structure/facility and include a reference system as part of the legend.

The scale should be 1"=200 ft

roads should be in a different color than the facilities for this map

Are there topsoil storage areas? They are not shown

The overburden areas are not shown. Does that mean there are none?

#### Map 4

legend and/or title should include an original date of the photo interpreted map. Revised date should be kept

Indicate the contour intervals in the legend

The black wavy lines are not defined in the legend. Is it vegetation?

What is the importance of the pink lines within the bonded area. it just looks like the bonded area is outside of the property boundary

#### Map 5

What is the importance of the pink lines within the bonded area. it just looks like the bonded area is outside of the property boundary

Provide elevations

provide contour intervals

within the proposed pit floor at 4650 ft elevation a pit lake can form and would act as a source for groundwater. Groundwater can flow to the east, south and west

see above - it could be a water impoundment

highwall on the north end exceeds 45-deg and is 350 feet high - state in the legend you have a highwall variance and the date the Division issued it. Also show the variance areas on a map

show areas that will be revegetated

state post mining land use on the map legend

Is this a reclamation map, if so, re-label the title and get away from final grading plan verbiage

indicate total reclamation acres on the map

Provide pit base elevation (even though it is shown in the profile)

It appears there is the pit impoundment and it may require a Division variance

You may need an erosion control variance due to the pit impoundment

Map 6

is existing ground the pre-mining surface? If not label the 'existing ground surface as of mmdd,yyyy

Ideally, three surfaces should be shown in each section, pre-mine, existing as of mmdd,yyyy, and proposed grade

Highwall variance? slopes exceed 45 deg

the y-axis data set could have a line that carries over to ease identifying elevation looks like the ends of proposed grade profile 1 is higher than the existing ground. Is that really the case?

This courtesy review of submitted maps 1-6 are within the context of the maps only.

This information should not be considered comprehensive and complete since the maps were reviewed independently of the plan.

Missing information includes: watershed and/or drainages should be shown and labeled.

If you have questions, please contact me.

-Beth Ericksen